

City of Excelsior  
Heritage Preservation Commission Meeting  
Minutes  
Wednesday, December 18, 2013

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Schmidt called the meeting to order at 7:02 PM.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Bipes, Bolles, Brabec, Macpherson and Schmidt

Absent: Finch, and Nelson

Others present: City Planner Braaten, and Advisor Caron

3. AGENDA APPROVAL

The agenda was unanimously approved with one revision, to move Item 8(a) up on the agenda to be heard right after Item 5.

It was move by Bolles, seconded by Macpherson, to approve the revised agenda. Approved unanimously.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

(a) Heritage Preservation Commission Meeting of November 19, 2013

It was moved by Macpherson, seconded by Bolles, to approve the meeting minutes with the two changes discussed. Approve unanimously.

5. CITIZEN REPORTS or COMMENTS

None

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

(a) Site Alteration Permit for Exterior Alterations at 205 Water Street – Matthew Kreilich, Victor’s on Water

The Commission had a brief discussion regarding Commissioner Macpherson recusing himself from the agenda item and determined that it was not necessary.

Braaten introduced the topic. He informed the Commission that the applicant had returned with revisions from the plan presented at the November 19<sup>th</sup> HPC meeting. The significant changes involved removal of the revolving doors and replacement with double doors, removal of the operable windows along Water Street but leaving them on Second Street, the storefront **façade design** has changed significantly, the canopy has been revised to be an overhang, the doors on Second Street were removed, and the mechanical screening details were provided.

Pauv Thouk explained that the retail space has had some foundation issues and serious settlement issues, so the retail space was redesigned prior to the meeting. **Discussion followed regarding the retail façade design, and block/tile counts for the restoration activities.**

Ms. Thouk explained the changes made based on the HPC’s comments at the previous meeting. The significant changes were the change to the **retail façade, the removal of openings along Second Street, the removal of the revolving door, the movement of the front door location on Water Street, the changes to the canopy, and the screening of the mechanical.**

Discussion followed regarding the retail space façade, the mechanical equipment, signs, and the material palette and manner of block repair.

Based on the comments of the Commission, Chair Schmidt listed multiple items that needed to be discussed/resolved, which included: the new retail storefront, the front door relocation, the canopy, lighting, the foundation issues, the Second Street windows, the Water Street windows, brick/tile restoration, and the flashing and bull nose tiles.

**Matt Krielich and Pauv Thouk explained the changes to the front façade** of the retail space. They informed the Commission that the almost white brick color was chosen by Mr. Brandow to be somewhat neutral. The majority of the Commission was not comfortable with the brick color choice and felt it needed to be changed to something more compatible with the Downtown Historic District. The Commission also commented that the proposed metal inset on the parapet did not meet the ordinance requirements or the character of the district and needed to be redesigned.

The Commission discussed the relocation of the front door, which is generally not permitted by preservation standards or the ordinance. Schmidt was okay with the relocation because the applicant was not adding a door, merely relocating the door. The front door as viewed from Water Street is offset to the left of center and the proposed door would have the same entry off of Water Street, but be offset to the right. Schmidt commented that it would not alter the character or design of the **building and/or remove any prominent details on the front façade.**

Bolles commented that he may be amenable to approving the relocation of the front door if the patching to be done where the previous front door would be would not be noticeable.

Macpherson commented that the proposed design shows that the applicant is striving to maintain the historic 1940s appearance of the building. The building has a very different design than many of the historic brick buildings in downtown, where the entries have a very significant placement in the design. The door location on this building is not as significant to the design and the proposed relocation still maintains the character and integrity of the building design.

Mr. Kreilich explained the proposed canopy along the Water Street **façade. The Commission, after much discussion, felt that the canopy** met the City Ordinance and Design Standards requirements and therefore was an acceptable design feature.

Bolles had some significant concerns regarding the brick/tile restoration and asked for specifics of how the brick/tile would be restored. Mr. Kreilich responded that they would hire a restoration professional and allow them to make that determination. Furthermore, the restoration work guidelines would have very specific language, which Mr. Kreilich stated could be provided to the Commission prior to the work if necessary.

Discussion followed regarding existing metal anchors in the façade and restoration work specifics.

Advisor Caron left the meeting at 9:07 PM.

Next the Commission discussed the proposed new windows along the **Second Street façade**. This included a proposed sliding window with a fixed screen to be opened in the more favorable weather months. The Commission was comfortable with the Second Street windows as long as they were consistent with the window sizing along Water Street.

Bolles commented that the proposed window rhythm and spacing was not appropriate and that as a solution, a more appropriate design would have 3 windows to the right of the new propose door location and the rest of the window along the front should have the same dimensions. Discussion followed regarding the Water Street windows. Brabec commented that the proposed window configuration and rhythm seemed appropriate to the period and fit the design of the building well.

After significant deliberation, the Commission determined that the applicant should redesign the windows to see if the sizing would work to have three windows to the right of the front door and carry that rhythm across the front of the building and the Second Street side. This redesign would be reviewed by a subcommittee. Mr. Kreilich stated he would be happy to revisit the window sizing, but if the sizing left an odd shaped window or disrupted the rhythm he felt it would not be appropriate to the style of the building. The Commission concurred that if the three window rhythm could not continue across the entire front façade the subcommittee could help to make that determination.

The Commission revisited the front door relocation and made the following findings: 1) the building architecture will be maintained, 2) the propose entrance relocation will have no negative historical significance, 3) the building is from the 1940s and the door location is not significant, 4) the relocation still maintains the integrity of the building design and architecture, 5) the proposed door relocation will not obscure or eliminate any architectural features, and 6) the proposed location is the exact mirror image of the existing entryway.

Schmidt commented, even though it is not in ordinance to allow comments on the interior of the building, the applicants are also uncovering a very historic interior wall feature, which he felt was also very important.

Bolles asked if the windows would be tinted in any way. Mr. Kreilich commented that all of the proposed windows would be clear glass.

The Commission discussed the proposed sign lighting. The Commission requested that the sign lighting be changed and reviewed by the subcommittee to make sure that it fit the building and design.

Finally, the Commission discussed the proposed retail space which had been significantly redesigned since the November HPC meeting. The HPC was okay with the removal of approximately 10 ft. of block/tile in order **to develop a more consistent front façade for the retail space** which was in keeping with the design and rhythm of the downtown historic district and to provide surplus block for use in repairing the front facade.

The Commission did have concerns with the proposed brick color choice and felt that the nearly white brick proposed did not meet the ordinance requirements, Design Standards or fit within the downtown historic district. They commented that the brick choice and the proposed metal parapet detail were much too modern for their proposed location. The Commission commented that more brick detailing instead of the metal detail panels would be more appropriate. The Commission and applicant discussed this issue at length and in the end determined that the final **design of the front façade of the retail space should be left to the subcommittee to determine when the applicant has had some time to redesign the exterior façade with a new brick color and parapet detailing.**

The Commission commented that the rear elevation of the retail space should also be redesigned to match the revised **front façade.**

It was moved by Macpherson, seconded by Brabec, to approved the Site Alteration Permit application with the following conditions subject to the approval of the subcommittee: 1) the window sizing and spacing be resolved, 2) the brick selection for the retail space should be more complementary, 3) the parapet design for the retail space should include brick detailing instead of the propose metal inset, 4) the sign lighting should be more period appropriate/less modern. Approved unanimously.

The subcommittee will consist of Mark Macpherson, Steve Finch and Bob Bolles.

6. MISCELLANEOUS/COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

(a) Recent City Council Actions

Due to the late hour this agenda item was not discussed.

7. NEW BUSINESS

None.

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

(a) Site Alteration Permit for Exterior Alterations at 205 Water Street – Matthew Kreilich, Victor's on Water

This agenda item was move up on the agenda at the beginning of the meeting to accommodate the applicant.

9. COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

(a) Exploring Grant Funds for Oak Hill Cemetery

None.

(b) Possibility of Historically Designating Portions of Excelsior Elementary School

None.

(c) Scenic Byway

None.

(d) Designate Liaison for Planning Commission Meeting – January 7, 2013

(e) Site Alteration Permits Administratively Approved

Braaten explained the one administratively approved Site Alteration Permit.

(f) Next Meeting – Tuesday, January 28<sup>th</sup>, 2013

10. ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by Bolles, seconded by Brabec, to adjourn. Approved unanimously.

Adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Lane L Braaten  
City Planner